

Title II of the Higher Education Act Institutional Report

Report Year 1

Academic year: 1999-2000

Fall 1999, Winter, 2000, Summer 2000

Institution name: **Lindenwood University**

Respondent name and title: Dr. Richard A. Boyle, Dean

Respondent phone number: (636)-949-4477 Fax: (636) 949-4992

Electronic mail address: rboyle@lindenwood.edu

Address: 209 S. Kingshighway

City: St. Charles

State: Missouri

Zip code: 63301

Section I. Pass rates.

Please provide the information in Tables C1 and C2 on the performance of completers of the teacher preparation program in your institution on teacher certification/licensure assessments used by your state.

Program completers for whom information should be provided are those completing program requirements in the most recent academic year. Thus, for institutional reports due to the state by April 7, 2001, the relevant information is for those completing program requirements in academic year 1999-2000. For purposes of this report, program completers do not include those who have completed an alternative route to certification or licensure as defined by the state.

The assessments to be included are the ones taken by these completers up to 5 years before their completion of program requirements, or up to 3 years afterward. (Please note that in 3 years institutions will report final pass rates that include an update on this cohort of completers; the update will reflect scores reported after the test closure date.) See guide pages 10 and 11.

In cases where a program completer has taken a given assessment more than once, the highest score on that test must be used. There must be at least 10 program completers taking the same assessment in an academic year for data on that assessment to be reported; for aggregate or summary data, there must also be at least 10 program completers (although not necessarily taking the same assessment) for data to be reported.

Note: The procedures for developing the information required for these tables are explained in the National Center for Education Statistics document entitled *Reference and Reporting Guide for Preparing State and Institutional Reports on the Quality of Teacher Preparation: Title II, Higher Education Act*. Terms and phrases in this questionnaire are defined in the glossary, appendix B of the guide.

Table C1: Single-Assessment Institution-Level Pass-rate Data: Regular Teacher Preparation Program

Institution Name	Lindenwood University						
Institution Code	6367						
State	Missouri						
Number of Program Completers Submitted	122						
Number of Program Completers found, matched, and used in passing rate Calculations¹	122						
					Statewide		
Type of Assessment	Assessment Code Number	Number Taking Assessment	Number Passing Assessment	Institutional Pass Rate	Number Taking Assessment	Number Passing Assessment	Statewide Pass Rate
Professional Knowledge							
PRINCIPLES LEARNING & TEACHING 5-9	523	1			135	133	99%

Academic Content Areas							
ELEM ED CURR INSTRUC ASSESSMENT	011	65	63	97%	1614	1547	96%
EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION	020	15	15	100%	256	256	100%
ENG LANG LIT COMP CONTENT KNOWLEDGE	041	4			172	168	98%
MATHEMATICS: CONTENT KNOWLEDGE	061	2			126	123	98%
SOCIAL STUDIES: CONTENT KNOWLEDGE	081	9			276	269	97%
PHYSICAL ED: CONTENT KNOWLEDGE	091	4			166	144	87%
BUSINESS EDUCATION	100	4			77	77	100%
MUSIC CONTENT KNOWLEDGE	113	3			129	122	95%
ART CONTENT KNOWLEDGE	133	8			75	75	100%
SPANISH CONTENT KNOWLEDGE	191	1			52	45	87%
BIOLOGY CONTENT KNOWLEDGE PART 1	231	2			92	90	98%
Other Content Areas							
SPEECH COMMUNICATION	220	1			35	35	100%
HEALTH EDUCATION	550	2			3		
Teaching Special Populations							
SPECIAL EDUCATION	350	1			207	207	100%

Table C2: Aggregate And Summary Institution-Level Pass-rate Data: Regular Teacher Preparation Program

Institution Name		Lindenwood University				
Institution Code		6367				
State		Missouri				
Number of Program Completers Submitted		122				
Number of Program Completers found, matched, and used in passing rate Calculations ¹		122				
				Statewide		
Type of Assessment ²	Number Taking Assessment ³	Number Passing Assessment ⁴	Institutional Pass Rate	Number Taking Assessment ³	Number Passing Assessment ⁴	Statewide Pass Rate
Aggregate - Basic Skills						
Aggregate - Professional Knowledge	1			144	142	99%
Aggregate - Academic Content Areas (Elementary Education, Math, English, Biology, etc.)	117	115	98%	3148	3026	96%
Aggregate - Other Content Areas (Career/Technical Education, Health Educations, etc.)	3			101	100	99%
Aggregate - Teaching Special Populations (Special Education, ELS, etc.)	1			319	318	100%
Aggregate - Performance Assessments						
Summary Totals and Pass Rates⁵	122	120	98%	3678	3553	97%

¹ The number of program completers found, matched and used in the passing rate calculation will not equal the sum of the column labeled "Number Taking Assessment" since a completer can take more than one assessment.

² Institutions and/or States did not require the assessments within an aggregate where data cells are blank.

³ Number of completers who took one or more tests in a category and within their area of specialization.

⁴ Number who passed all tests they took in a category and within their area of specialization.

⁵ Summary Totals and Pass Rate: Number of completers who successfully completed one or more tests across all categories used by the state for licensure and the total pass rate.

Section II. Program information.

A Number of students in the regular teacher preparation program at your institution:

Please specify the number of students in your teacher preparation program during academic year 1999-2000, including all areas of specialization.

1. Total number of students enrolled during 1999-2000: **938**

B Information about supervised student teaching:

2. How many students (in the regular program and any alternative route programs) were in programs of supervised student teaching during academic year 1999-2000? **152**

3. Please provide the numbers of supervising faculty who were:

8 Appointed full-time faculty in professional education: an individual who works full time in a school, college, or department of education, and spends at least part of the time in supervision of teacher preparation students.

6 Appointed part-time faculty in professional education and full-time in the institution: any full time faculty member in the institution who also may be supervising or teaching in the teacher preparation program.

2 Appointed part-time faculty in professional education, not otherwise employed by the institution: may be part time university faculty or pre-K-12 teachers who supervise prospective teachers. The numbers do not include K-12 teachers who simply receive a stipend for supervising student teachers. Rather, this third category is intended to reflect the growing trend among institutions of higher education to appoint K-12 teachers as clinical faculty, with the rights and responsibilities of the institution's regular faculty.

Supervising faculty for purposes of this data collection includes all persons who the institution regards as having faculty status and who were assigned by the teacher preparation program to provide supervision and evaluation of student teaching, with an administrative link or relationship to the teacher preparation program.

Total number of supervising faculty for the teacher preparation program during 1999-2000: **16**

4. The student/faculty ratio was (divide the total given in B2. by the number given in B3.): **9.5**
5. The average number of hours per week required of student participation in supervised student teaching in these programs was: **33** hours. The total number of weeks of supervised student teaching required is **16**. The total number of hours required is **528** hours.

C Information about state approval or accreditation of teacher preparation programs:

6. Is your teacher preparation program currently approved or accredited by the state?

X Yes ☐ No

7. Is your teacher preparation program currently under a designation as "low-performing" by the state (as per section 208 (a) of the HEA of 1998)? ☐ Yes **X** No

NOTE: See appendix A of the guide for the legislative language referring to "low-performing" programs.

Section III. Contextual information (optional).

A. Please use this space to provide any additional information that describes your teacher preparation program(s).

The Teacher Preparation Program at Lindenwood University is designed to foster in its students and faculty a broad understanding and commitment to individuals and society through the teaching

and learning process. We believe teaching in both an art and a science. As a science, there are certain skills, techniques, and methods that can be learned and developed. Therefore, we believe that students need frequent opportunities to practice these skills in a supportive and reflective environment. Students are provided with the techniques and procedures necessary to be effective teachers, as well as practical experience in the public schools in order to put these acquired techniques and procedures to practice in a “real-life” setting. As a science, the profession is engaged in ongoing research in its quest for knowledge to improve effective teaching practices. We believe our education program should be built upon this research base and that it is important to develop in our students.

Lindenwood University supports efforts to establish and maintain high quality teacher preparation programs in Missouri. Clear, objective, measurable standards related to knowledge of the subject taught and teaching success in the real world classroom settings are the essential components of teacher preparation assessment. In order to encourage the competency of beginning teachers, Lindenwood University provides the following support services to graduates of the Teacher Preparation Program who meet all institutional requirements and have earned at least 60 hours of the coursework from Lindenwood.

1) Knowledge of the Subject Taught:

Lindenwood University will provide up to 18 credit hours of appropriate refresher coursework to any qualified Lindenwood University graduate who does not pass the first administration of the PRAXIS II upon the request of, and at no tuition cost to the student.

2) No one can judge the effectiveness of a beginning teacher more accurately than the administrator who hires and supervises the teacher. Lindenwood annually conducts a survey of employers to determine the effectiveness of each Missouri beginning teacher graduating from our University. The survey is based on the ten standards approved by the State Board of Education for beginning teachers. Lindenwood University will provide up to one semester of appropriate coursework to any qualified Lindenwood graduate not considered at least qualified by the employing school district during their first year of teaching, upon the request of, and at no tuition cost to the student.

B. Missouri has asked each institution to include at least the following information.

1. Institution Mission

The Mission of Lindenwood University

Lindenwood University offers values-centered programs leading to the development of the whole person-an educated, responsible citizen of a global community.

Lindenwood is committed to

- providing an integrative liberal arts curriculum,
- offering professional and pre-professional degree programs,
- focusing on the talents, interests, and future of the student
- supporting academic freedom and the unrestricted search for truth,
- affording cultural enrichment to the surrounding community,
- promoting ethical lifestyles,
- developing adaptive thinking and problem-solving skills,
- furthering lifelong learning

2. Educational Philosophy and 3. Conceptual Frameworks

LINDENWOOD UNIVERSITY

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

FOCUSED, MULTICULTURAL, AND GLOBAL

The conceptual framework for the Lindenwood University Teacher Preparation Program is driven by the Mission Statement of the University and the 10 Standards for Beginning Teachers in Missouri. The Undergraduate Teacher Education Statement of Principles

and a philosophy of reflection serve the Division as the connection with the needs and philosophies of the pK-12 school community. Lindenwood University's liberal arts program helps to insure that our students take a multicultural and global view as they meet the challenges of teaching in the twenty-first century. Diversity in our society will no longer allow our public schools to sanitize history. Race, religion and ethnicity must be addressed according to Diane Ravitch (1990).

After having reviewed the above documents again in light of our own educational philosophies, we have agreed that the model that best reflects our common effort was the concept of teaching as both an art and a science. We have agreed that art, a stimulating and harboring of creativity, along with a scientific attitude and other scientific considerations, must be the basis on which to build a total educational scheme including the admission of candidates, the construction and maintenance of curriculum, the structuring of clinical experiences, and the support of newly-employed professionals. We believe that the act of teaching is a blend of " Art" and "Science." Our program is

based on this concept and is driven by personal reflection to assure that our students embrace this understanding in their personal philosophy of education.

TEACHING AS AN ART

As a liberal arts institution, Lindenwood University has provided the basis for our education students to become well-rounded, interesting adults capable of expressing themselves in creative, effective, and meaningful ways. The teacher education curriculum, practica experiences, courses, and assessment practices have been aligned to enhance the professional development of our pre-service teacher preparation. Our program relies on the developed creativity of individuals in presenting themselves, as well as, their lesson plans in meaningful and interesting formats. Lieberman says it well, " ...the reality of teaching is a craft learned on the job, [and] when viewed as a craft, teaching makes sense as a messy and highly personal enterprise, for it concerns itself with the making and remaking of an object until it satisfies the standards of its creator."

As a teacher preparation program, we design our course syllabi to nurture the creativity found in our students. Through practica our students observe first hand the artistry of teachers in the classroom setting. Here, the art and science of teaching are observed as co-dependent and reinforce our belief. Our students are prepared to handle the unpredictability of teaching referred to by Gage (1985) "Teaching can be considered an art because teaching must improvise and spontaneously handle a tremendous number of factors that interact in often unpredictable and nonsystematic ways in classroom settings." While a certain amount of artistry, in the form of motivation, vitality, and talent, must be brought with candidates who enter the program, it is our belief that the necessary teacher artistry can be nurtured in an atmosphere of creativity and individual attention. These processes cannot be developed by methods which rely solely on rules/formulas, or algorithms. Using the analogy of medicine and engineering, Gage (1978) explains:

To practice medicine and engineering requires a knowledge
of much science: concepts, or variables, and the inter-
relationships in the form of strong or weak laws, generalizations,

or trends. But using the science to achieve practical ends requires artistry ...knowing when to follow the implications of the laws, generalizations, and trends, and especially, when NOT to. ... (p.18)

Madeline Hunter (1989) whose "steps in the teaching act" have been wrongly interpreted as a rigid teaching formula, reiterates the importance of artistry in teaching when she states: "You are a true professional if you are making decisions which combine the science of human learning with your own teaching style to design and artistically implement effective lessons." (p.18)

TEACHING AS A SCIENCE

The influence of technology on teaching methods, new insight from brain research, and evolving pedagogical practices all require a scientific basis for decisions that are made in the teaching process. Missouri Standards are embraced as a foundation for teacher preparation activities and experiences. The Undergraduate Teacher Education Program Objectives guide our faculty in aligning syllabi with our liberal arts foundation and the course requirements and content. A graduate of our teacher preparation program who blends creativity and science is a goal of the Lindenwood University Teacher Education Program. "Although science can't offer absolute guidance for teachers as they plan and implement instructional strategies, research can provide a scientific basis for the art of teaching. Is teaching an art or science? The answer is 'yes.'" (Gage, 1985)

ASSESSMENT

The success of our program is gauged by ongoing assessment of annual surveys of recent graduates, cooperating teachers, and principals. Our emphasis on the development of portfolios is in agreement with Campbell and others (1997), "...our students [need] more authentic, broad-based and holistic ways to demonstrate their growing professional competence." As a division, faculty review PRAXIS results and analyze student evaluations of teaching methods and course content. This ongoing review helps to keep our objectives before us as we refine and redesign our program. While many designs for lessons are available for review, the education division realizes that some consistency is needed to keep our pre-service teachers focused on learning. Lesson plan design at Lindenwood University does embrace some of the elements of the work of Madeline Hunter. We believe that this direct instruction model can serve as the basis for students to understand lesson plan development. With the number of districts employing our students and the feedback we receive from our employing districts, we believe that this methodology has served us well over the years. From this base, our graduates can modify and adjust to the requirements of their employer. We continue to use the construct on the following page that depicts the blending of art and science in our teacher preparation program.

3. Program completers who teach in the private schools and out of state

Private Schools: 13

Out-of-State Schools: